Ham-Policy Digest   Sun, 4 Sep 94   Volume 94 : Issue 421

Today's Topics:
                    CW as a license requirement
        How many categories? (was Learning CW, a newbie view)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 3 Sep 1994 14:31:45 GMT
From: linet02.li.net!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CW as a license requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I see it this way:

In times of old, CW was an essential mode to know since so many used it.

It is still the most effective way to get a signal across with the
least amount of power and through the worst of conditions. HOWEVER,
that was in a time with very little (amateur radiowise) alternatives.
Certainly before microwaves and satellites were in common use.

Our licensing requirements are now unbalanced. I can see where, given a
choice of two modes to operate (SSB and CW) in the old days that if CW
were not a requirement for licensing, that many would have never learned
the code and would be unable to communicate on 50% of the modes
available. This was doubly important when you remember that CW was a

primary ship-bound communications method.   Now, even though we have
numerous modes available, we still must learn CW. This is not a bad
thing at all; I don't operate CW, but I still know it. I enjoy
using it when I do which is very rare.

HOWEVER: I submit that since CW is no longer used on ships (except for
a few? I'm not sure), and since there are so many modes available to
hams, that having proficiency in ONE as a licensing requirement is
no longer in the best interest of Ham Radio.   And, it's also unbalanced.
Why not a proficiency test in satellite ops? Or packet?

If you want to use a mode, fine. But I don't think that forcing someone
to learn any mode is neccessary anymore.   But, since CW is a requirement
for under 30Mhz ops (currently), we are kinda stuck with it. So
perhaps we do need to eliminate the 13/20 wpm speed exams. Perhaps
we might also kick around the idea of a proficiency exam in a particular
mode before you can use it. But then the problem becomes "how can you
get proficient in something you cannot practice?".   What's the answer?
I don't know. I do know that we are not advancing the radio art much,
nor are we staying ahead of communications technology (my modem goes
28.8kbps, my TNC 1200bps... enough said..).   Are the two issues related?
Perhaps. Perhaps. Of course, 10 years from now, hindsight will be
20/20.

73 de N2MUO

****
*   :JOE TOMASONE: GOD IS REAL; UNLESS DECLARED INTEGER   *
* INTERNET: jtomason@li.net   AMPR AX.25: N2MUO@N2BQF.#NLI.NY.USA   *
****

Date: Fri, 02 Sep 1994 16:19:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!eff!
wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.
Subject: How many categories? (was Learning CW, a newbie view)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

Mr. Deignan,

You would be surprised at how many of the points in your letter I agree

with. Blaming the code free test for 'dumb extras' is silly. And blaming
those that argue anti-testing here, for 'dumbed down' tests, is equally
silly. Almost to a man, everyone here has proposed increasing the level
of the testing. Myself, for example. I would love to see much more
testing on rules and porvedures (safety and otherwise) on the tech test.
And removal of HF questions on licenses not giving HF access.

I could quickly agree with you totally if you were not so much more, IMO,
intent on 'blame' as in fixing the problem.

I have made this challange before, I make it again. Who is willing to put
together and submit questions to be ADDED to the existing pools? We could
even do it as a thread right here! Any takers?

>Here is a first step: revise the licensing structure so there is only two
>classes of amateur license:
>
>Class: Privs: Requirements:
>
>Class B: 50mhz+, full power   85% on 100-question theory
>   28mhz - 50mhz, 100 watts   examination which encompasses
>   1.6-28mhz (CW band   all existing theory exams.
>   portions only), 100 watts
>
>
>Class A: All bands, full legal power Class B theory exam plus
>   10wpm CW test
>
>
>The reasoning behind this license structure is quite simple. We have too many
>licenses now. It creates division and a caste system within the hobby. By
>having two licenses, we simplify the licensing structure and process.

I agree. Just a question or two;

Why 85% as opposed to the current 70%, it seems that 70% is fairly common
as a 'passing' grade in the world. Why make the ARS different?

Why no additonal theory in the class A license? I would think AT LEAST the
VE administrative question would belong there. Unless Class B's could be
VE's also.

You said CW only, does this include digital? As there are no CW-only bands
on HF (I believe). And what about that pesky ITU treaty?

Dan N8PKV

--
"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
 safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

- Misspelled? Impossible, my modem is error correcting!

Date: Fri, 02 Sep 1994 16:42:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!eff!
wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CvFLq4.EMu@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <345ak1$nof@abyss.West.Sun.COM>,
<CvHL5H.Drw@news.Hawaii.Edu>ch.ed
Subject : Re: Simplicity of gear (was Re: Code Must GO! or stay!?)

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>[White flag goes up momentarily]
>
>To be truthful, I am really impressed with how you and everyone else
>on this net are able to present clear and thoughtful arguments to
>back up their honest beliefs. (It took one beer to admit that.)
>
>The time has come for me to perminently retire from .policy. I need
>to spend much more time on my phd studies. I realize that the feelings
>on here are so deeply seeded that one side will never convince the
>other side to change. But the debate has been fun and challenging.
>Thanks guys (and gals!)
>
>73's my friends: Dana, Cecil, Clay, Dan, Dan, Cliff, Alan, Paul, Gary,
>Tom, Dick, and Harry,
>
>Jeff NH6IL
>
>[White flag yanked back down]

God NO. Oh well, for the reason given, I understand Jeff. PLEASE come back
when you have your Phd. I assume that it is math you are gonna pile higher
and deeper? Good luck. Best wishes. And break a leg. I hope to see you
from time to time, at least in email. Stop in now and then, just to
say HI and let us know how you are doing.

You have taught me a lot and made me see even more. You will be missed.

See you in email more offten, I guess. The place won't be the same without

you.

Sincerely Your Friend,

Dan N8PKV
--
"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
 safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

- Misspelled? Impossible, my modem is error correcting!

Date: Fri, 02 Sep 1994 16:40:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!eff!
wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <JY7zmu-.edellers@delphi.com>, <3478af$18t@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>,
<wyn.185.2E672A78@ornl.gov>comp
Subject : Re: More Code.

wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX) writes:

>In article <3478af$18t@cat.cis.Brown.EDU> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P.
Deignan) writes:
>
>>|> Why? Code knowledge is not needed for any other mode. The TWO basic modes
>>|> below 29 MHz are CW and SSB, but it's not credible to say that either is the
>>|> SINGLE dominant mode.
>
>>You've already demonstrated operating proficiency in SSB operation even
>>before you've taken your first ham exam. You do know how to talk, don't you?
>
>>MD
>   ***
>   WARNING, DANGER
>   A VOICE OF REASON AND LOGIC HAS ONCE AGAIN
>   ENTERED THE CYBERSPACE OF THIS
>   DEBATE
>   TAKE EVASIVE ACTION IMMEDIATELY
>   ***

No, but when it does, we'll call you.

Dan
--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
 safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

- Misspelled? Impossible, my modem is error correcting!

Date: Fri, 02 Sep 1994 15:45:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CvDnKn.H5E@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <082994212623Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<CvHBF6.Aqz@news.Hawaii.Edu>at.
Subject : Re: CW ...IS NOW!

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>In article <082994212623Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
writes:
>>jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>
>
>>>Now, Dan, you're interpretation is of what we're saying is incorrect;
>>>no one has said that knowledge of code instills a desire to build -
>
>>No, you implyed it. Or more accruately I, correctly IMHO, infered it.
>
>Nope again. Knowledge of code *enables* one to start their building
>with simple CW rigs. The conflict is the words `enables' vs `instills
>a desire'. Subtle but very important.

But Jeff. How does REQUIREING exclusive mode specific testing fit into
this? There are many modes that could be REQUIRED to BETTER provide that
pool of trained operators, etc. Why should manual morse stand out TODAY?

>>>You've indirectly quenched his desire to learn building skills since
>>>constructing any other mode of transmitter is too complex for him.
>
>>No, you ASSUME that the only place to start building is manually encoded
>>morse CW stations. Others have posted numerious examples of other options.
>>And you have failed to demonstrate that all experimenters MUST start
>>there. Because other types of transmitters are too complex for YOU to
>>understand, do not assume that others have the same limitations.
>
>Only Dana has suggested another mode: AM. If you've got an HF rcvr
>count the number of AM QSO's on the bands today.

So it is an underutilized mode and should be supported by government
subsidy just like CW? After all, manual morse in the rest of RF (the areas
we provide the pool FOR!) are dwindling. Maybe a mode specific test for
SSB (the MOST popular HF mode according to the ARRL survey). Lets face it,
SSB operating techniques are different (GREATLY!) from FM. Though your
arguement about all knowing how to speak could be argued, SSB requires a
skill not used in every day activites. Not to the same extent as FM would.

>And let me clarify something: I am *not* bashing AM. My first
>station was a DX-60 and an HR-10; the DX-60 only had CW and AM.
>My first 2M radio was a Heath Two'er - AM only.

The you support a pass/fail mode specific test for AM?

73 My Friend,

Dan
--
"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
 safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

- Misspelled? Impossible, my modem is error correcting!

Date: Fri, 02 Sep 1994 15:55:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!eff!
wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CvFKnJ.E8o@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <090194060953Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<CvHCAr.B2F@news.Hawaii.Edu>umich.ed
Subject : Re: CW ...IS NOW!

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>(Dan Pickersgill) writes:
>
>>(Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>
>>>(Alan Wilensky) writes:
>
>>>>just worked a USCG cutter on 2m. Radio officer says, yes, no more code
>>>>training, no key on ship. They do not handle distress traffic by CW,
>>>>they use SELCAL RTTY. His words, "a far superior mode than CW for
>>>>handling all types of routine and distress traffic". His call was N1KTG.
>

```
>>>There is no `radio officer' on a cutter.  He was a `radioman'.
>
>>Watch it Jeff, you opened yourself up here. I believe the Radio Officer was
>>at USCG Boston. Or are you saying that shore stations do not have a Radio
>>Officer?
>
>The Coast Guard does  not use the title `Radio Officer'; that is a
>Maritime Radio Service  title. The officer in charge at a CG
>shore station is called `Commanding Officer' (or CO), regardless
>of the purpose of that shore station: Search and Rescue, Communications,
>Aid To Navigation, etc.

Yep, as I currently understant it, you are correct.

>>You can state a lie all
>>you want, it does not make it fact. You can call dog shit a steak dinner
>>if you like, it is still, DOG SHIT.
>
>Now you're starting to sound like Angus and his foul mouth.

Well, it is still dog shit, but you are right, Sir. I appologize AT LEAST
for capatalizing it.

>>And aside from that, the ARRL survey released 3 or so years ago showed CW
>>as the THIRD most popular mode.
>
>Not on HF. Why not conduct your own survey by actually *listening*
>and counting if you don't believe me. The proof is as  close as
>your HF rcvr. Remember though, a single trial count on a single
>band doesn't provide an  accurate count. Conduct your count
>during the day on 20, 17, 15, and 12 meters; towards the evening
>move to 30, then late evening on 80 and 160. Do this over a
>one week period to catch the variations of weekday and weekend
>activity. Good luck though during contests!

Ok, it is the SECOND most popular mode generally used on HF. And I am not
interested on conducting a survey to see how many people who have PASSED a
13 WPM code test CHOOSE to use code. It is a self selected group. It is
not a far surevey of use. I have no desire to personally attempt a
scientific survey, no time for that.

Respondants in the ARRL surevey were asked 'modes regularly used', I
believe, and came up with the 38% number. This was JUST after the
inception of the code test free license so that does not enter into it in
large numbers.

If you had said that the NH6IL survey showed... I would not argue. But you
continually state it as FACT. It is not FACT. It is not established,
```

except by your unscientific observations. If you stated it as such I would
not take exception.

>Also, I thing your confused concerning the ARRL survey. The
>percentages total over 100%. I believe that the participants
>were asked how much time they spend on the various modes.
>FM came out on top, but of course that doesn't count since
>one doesn't need code to get on VHF; this newsgroup was
>created to discuss the code requirement to get on HF.

Requards the survey see above.

I thought this group predated the code test free license. And was created
to move code discussions off .misc. In any case, you then agree that
circut design is not appropriate for this group?

>Thus,
>
>>So 38% (according to the ARRL survey) of the amateurs use 50% of the QSO's
>>on HF?
>
>is a false interpretation, and

It should have read, 38% of the amateurs CONDUCT 50% of the QSO's on HF.
As the ARRL survey stated that 38% regularly use that mode (if my
understanding of the survey is correct, if not please correct me).

>
>> 50%, actually 38%,
>
>is also false.

Not according to the ARRL survey, in contrast the the NH6IL sampleing.

Dan
--
"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
 safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

- Misspelled? Impossible, my modem is error correcting!

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #421
****